FORT PIERCE CITY COMMISSION AND
ST. LUCIE COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSION

JOINT WORKSHOP
SUMMARY REPORT ON THE
PORT OF FT. PIERCE MASTER PLAN

February 19, 2002
1:30 - 3:30 PM

St. Lucie County Commission Chambers

Meeting Design & Facilitation By:

Florida Conflict Resolution
C O N S O R T I U M

Report By Jeff A. Blair and Rafael Montalvo
Website: consensus.fsu.edu

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	2
Agenda	3
Activities	4
Discussion of Key Issues	5
Attachment 1	11

INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND

On February 19, 2002 the FAU Joint Center team preparing the Ft. Pierce Port Master Plan conducted a facilitated joint workshop with the Fort Pierce City Commission and the St. Lucie County Board of County Commission. The workshop was designed to allow Commissioners to provide feedback on the third draft of the Port Master Plan and to test Commissioners' level of support for the draft.

Prior to the joint workshop, Commissioners were asked to fill out a survey indicating their level of support for Draft II of the goals and objectives for the Port Master Plan.

In response to the survey results and extensive public comment compiled during three facilitated public input workshops, the Joint Center prepared a third draft of the proposed master plan for review and discussion at the February 19, 2002 joint workshop.

Commissioners were asked to provide feedback on the refinements made between Draft II and Draft III, and to offer any further recommendations for changes to the third Draft.

WORKSHOP PROCESS

The team provided the Commissioners with an overview of the survey results, refinements made between Draft II and Draft III in response to memberÆs and public concern, and then asked for comments and suggestions for refinements to Draft III. Commissioners were asked to express their comments and level of support on Draft III refinements and proposed changes offered during the workshop for the proposed Port of Ft. Pierce Master Plan.

The workshop was facilitated by the Florida Conflict Resolution Consortium and records of the discussions made on easel-pads during the course of the workshop. A more detailed description of the process used for each discussion is included in the corresponding sections of this report. This report presents the results of discussions and decisions made by the Commissioners at the joint workshop, based on transcripts of the easel-pad notes.

WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES

- To review elected officials and public comments received since presentations to City Commission and County Commission.
- To review refinements made to the draft in response to input received.
- To discuss and agree on any additional refinements needed.

AGENDA

The following agenda was used during the workshop. The full agenda packet used by participants is available separately from the consultant team.

1:30 **Welcome and Introductions**

1:35 **Introduction of Consultant Team**

1:40 **Agenda and Process Review**

1:50 **Review of Survey Results**

Review of key issues identified in the survey.

Identification of additional issues for discussion, if any.

2:00 **Discussion of Key Issues**

For each of the key issues identified in the survey:

- Review and clarify draft responses to previous elected official and public comment;
- Discussion of further refinements, if needed;
- Consensus-testing, as appropriate.

3:20 **Next Steps**

3:30 **Adjourn**

MEMBERS PRESENT

St. Lucie County

Doug Coward, Chairman
Frannie Hutchinson, Commissioner
Cliff Barnes, Commissioner
Paula Lewis, Commissioner
John Bruhn, Commissioner
County Attorney - Dan McIntyre
County Administrator - Doug Anderson

Fort Pierce

Edward Enns, Mayor
Rufus Alexander, Commissioner
R. Duke Nelson, Commissioner
Christine Coke, Commissioner
Robert Benton, Commissioner
Dennis Beach - City Manager
Robert Schwerer - City Attorney

WORKSHOP PROCESS

- Review of workshop agenda and objectives
- Review of workshop participation guidelines, facilitator's role and consultant's role
- Orientation to workshop packet/materials
- Overview of survey results
- Overview of refinements to Draft II to Draft III changes
- Topic discussion order based on survey results
- Facilitator's will introduce each topic and team will provide an overview of refinements to draft II reflected in draft III
- Facilitator's will ask for clarifying questions first
- Comments/Discussion
- Proposed options
- Pros and cons
- Test for consensus

ACTIVITIES

REVIEW OF SURVEY RESULTS **(See Attachment 1)**

The facilitators noted that in general the survey's indicated a high level of support for Draft II with most objectives receiving an average consensus-ranking of 4 or higher. Those objectives that received less than a 4 would be highlighted for discussion at today's joint workshop. In addition, it was noted that many refinements had been made in Draft III to address concerns identified in the survey results and through public comment. Commissioners were reminded that since refinements had been made in Draft III comments and suggested changes should be based on the third draft.

The team suggested a discussion order based on survey responses to Draft II. All objectives that received an average score of under 4 on a scale of from 5 to 1ùwith 5 indicating agreement and 1 indicating disagreement would be discussed first.

The following discussion order was suggested and approved by Commission members:

Goal 1 Responsibility for the Port including boundary area
- Objective 1.1
- Objective 1.2

Goal 7 Navigation Channels
- Objective 7.1

Goal 6 Landside Infrastructure
- Objective 6.1

Goal 2 Port Activities
- Objective 2.3

Goal 3 Environmental Protection
- Objective 3.1

The following objectives, which received high consensus-test results, were also identified by Commissioners as priorities for discussion.

Objectives: 2.1, 2.2, 2.4, 3.3, 4.1

Following discussion and agreement on refinements to the above referenced objectives, Commissioners were asked to identify any additional objectives they would like to discuss.

DISCUSSION OF KEY ISSUES

Goal 1 Responsibility for the Port including boundary area
Objective 1.1

Comments
Objective 1.1
Re: Goal 1 Does "vested" by "Law" modify ownership?
Role of title? Flag for clarification.

Critical that Ft. Pierce have major input on Port Authority

- Was "conjunction" stronger than "cooperation"?
- Need 2 years?
  Yes, from County's perspective.
- If we don't know who "Port" is, how can we say what it should do?

Policies 1.1-1.15

- Does deletion of - unless Port Authority legislatively established make it harder to do this?

Policy 1.1.1

- Add "local" elected officials (Policy leaves open possibility of working with city later)
- Leave authority as is for now

Approved Refinements to 1.1
Add local officials to policy 1.1.1

Test for Consensus on 1.1
The 10 Commission members unanimously expressed their support for Objective 1.1 including the approved refinements listed above.

Objective 1.2

Comments

Objective 1.2

- Port of Ft. Pierce is a geographical area. This requires a person to be in charge.

Policy 1.2.2

- Does this eliminate the possibility of using northern section for megayachts? Make sure it doesn't.
- Use tourist, commercial and recreational uses to give more flexibility.

Approved Refinements to 1.2

Use tourist, commercial and recreational uses in 1.2.3

Test for Consensus on 1.2

The 10 Commission members unanimously expressed their support for Objective 1.2 including the approved refinements listed above.

Goal 7 Navigation Channels

Objective 7.1

Comments

- Does this exclude future needs? Does this mean we will adamantly stay with this even if a future need that is different comes up?
- Goal and objective language inconsistent with each other.
- Seems to create a legal duty to maintain at 28 - may create liability for port if not maintained.
- Heard from Harbor Branch yet?
- Shall maintain maximum channel depth and maximum channel width - important to worm reefs and ledges û economically important and important to fish and lobster.
- Survey, document and protect worm reefs. (See prepared statement)
- Require EIS to change width.
- There is opportunity to promote high quality economic development within current depth and width. Ditto comment on width.
- Concern about future needs someone in future may not be concerned about snook or snooper.
- Concern about including specific #s - what if needs change - but probably won't make a difference.
- Change goal language existing and limited (?) - future needs?
- Any concerns about width- One concern, may need to change.
- If change needed, can be changed.
- Concerns about deleting future needs.
- Don't agree with 28" will meet future needs
- Future needs as outlined in this plan - General agreement.
- What would be reaction to military use to Port?

~~Maintain~~ support a maximum channel depth

Approved Refinements to 7.1
~~Maintain~~ support a maximum channel depth

Research, define, and specify a maximum channel width in the Plan.

Test for Consensus on 7.1
The 10 Commission members unanimously expressed their support for Objective 7.1 including the approved refinements listed above.

Goal 6 - Landside Infrastructure
Objective 6.1
Comments
- Why were DCA and OTTED left off? Add
- 6.1.2 Assumption - St. Lucie County as port authority? Yes
- Better to say Port of Ft. Pierce.
- Little need to link airport and seaport û no objection, but should not be a priority to increase link or invest.

To city's benefit to keep link concept in plan.

Approved Refinements to 6.1
Add DCA and OTTED to list.
Replace St. Lucie County with Port of Ft. Pierce.

Test for Consensus on 6.1
The 10 Commission members unanimously expressed their support for Objective 6.1 including the approved refinements listed above.

Goal 2 - Port Activities
Objective 2.3
Comments
2.3.1
- Does removal of repair yards and marine facilities preclude those for megayachts?
- Related service needs covers those?
- May also need repair yard to service small or regular sized boats already there. Leave in

2.3.2
- Add research vessels.
- Add or specify port for tall ships (sailing ships).

2.3.2
Why was Charrette reference kept here? And not elsewhere? Not needed.

Approved Refinements to 2.3

Indicate Port's designation as a tall sailing ship port.

2.3.1 Add additional examples of activities, i.e., boat service and repair yards, and marina facilities.

2.3.2 add; i.e., research vessels.

Remove reference to Port of Ft. Pierce Charrette.

Test for Consensus on 2.3

The 10 Commission members unanimously expressed their support for Objective 2.3 including the approved refinements listed above.

Objective 2.2

Comments

Policy 2.2.3

- Move eminent domain.
- Better define appropriate unit of government, mechanisms
- Should or shall? Shall?
- Legal issue û mandatory to spend $Æs for eminent domain.
- Consultant or Attorneys.

Approved Refinements to 2.2

Move eminent domain to end of 2.2.3

Test for Consensus on 2.2

The 10 Commission members unanimously expressed their support for Objective 2.2 including the approved refinements listed above.

Goal 3 Environmental Protection

Objective 3.1

Comments

Storm water systems not currently adequate - need to invest to retrofit.

Approved Refinements to 3.1

None made.

Test for Consensus on 3.1

The 10 Commission members unanimously expressed their support for Objective 3.1 as proposed in Draft III.

Objective 2.1

Comments

Enhance economic prosperity instead of exceed average salary. That is a sliding scale.

Test for Consensus on 2.1

The 10 Commission members unanimously expressed their support for Objective 2.1 as proposed in Draft III.

Objective 2.4

Test for Consensus on 2.4

The 10 Commission members unanimously expressed their support for Objective 2.4 as proposed in Draft III.

Objective 3.3

Test for Consensus on 3.3

The 10 Commission members unanimously expressed their support for Objective 3.3 as proposed in Draft III.

Objective 4.1

Test for Consensus on 4.1

The 10 Commission members unanimously expressed their support for Objective 4.1 as proposed in Draft III.

Goal 8 Manatee Protection

Policy 8.1.1

Comments

Adjusting future and proposed? If so specify.

Approved Refinements to 8.1

Policy 8.1.1 applies to future and proposed docks and not existing.

Test for Consensus on 8.1

The 10 Commission members unanimously expressed their support for Objective 8.1 as proposed in Draft III.

Objective 5.2

Comments

- No language addressing types of materials we don't want to see?

- Agree, but we need history (info).
- Oremulsion, aregonite.
- How do you specify which?
- How do you enforce? Can you legally?
- Environmental protection policies may suffice.
- This may be a reason for port to be in public ownership, so public.
- Would like to see at least broader language that we do not want to see hazardous materials commerce going in and out. Would provide direction for RFP.
- Would like to see height limit (100Æ. Conditional use above that.
- Hazardous materials and heights land û use and zoning issues. Would policy infringe on this?
- Leave with city.

Approved Refinements to 5.2

Draft should reflect general policy that Port will not be used for hazardous materials commerce.

Test for Consensus on 5.2

The 10 Commission members unanimously expressed their support for Objective 5.2 as proposed in Draft III.

New Goal 3 policy

Comments

Do not want to see north south bulkheads û whenever we improve shoreline would rather do so in a way that absorbs energy.

Test for Consensus on new policy to Goal 3

The 10 Commission members unanimously expressed their support for a new policy in Goal 3 that would encourage wave energy absorbing bulkheads in the Port area.

ATTACHMENT 1
Port of Ft. Pierce Master Plan
Draft Goals, Objectives, and Policies Survey

	Objective	City Average	County Average
Goal 1 - Responsibility for the Port			
	1.1	1.33	2.33
	1.2	2.5	4.7
Goal 2 - Port Activities			
	2.1	4.67	4.33
	2.2	4.83	4.0
	2.3	4.8	3.7
	2.4	5.0	5.0
	2.5	4.83	4.0
Goal 3 - Environmental Protection			
	3.1	4.83	3.7
	3.2	4.67	4.7
	3.3	4.5	4.33
Goal 4 - Public Access			
	4.1	4.5	4.33
Goal 5 - Emergency Management			
	5.1	5.0	5.0
	5.2	4.8	5.0
Goal 6 - Landside Infrastructure			
	6.1	4.5	3.0
Goal 7 - Navigation Channels			
	7.1	4.2	1.67
Overall Reaction to the Draft		**4.0**	**3.33**

STATE OF FLORIDA

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS

"Dedicated to making Florida a better place to call home"

JEB BUSH
Governor

STEVEN M. SEIBERT
Secretary

February 27, 2002

RECEIVED
MAR - 1 2002
COUNTY ATTORNEY

Daniel S. McIntyre
County Attorney
St. Lucie County
2300 Virginia Avenue
Fort Pierce, Florida 34982-5652

RE: Port of Fort Pierce - Procedure for Adoption of Port Master Plan

Dear Mr. McIntyre:

This is in response to your letter of February 25, 2002 regarding the procedures for the adoption of a port master plan. I agree with your assessment and concur that St. Lucie County is now the "appropriate local government" for integrating the port master plan into the County's comprehensive plan pursuant to the provisions of Section 163.3178(2)(k), Florida Statutes.

Let me know if you have any further questions regarding this matter.

Sincerely,

Richard A. Lotspeich
Assistant General Counsel

RAL/ms

2555 SHUMARD OAK BOULEVARD • TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32399-2100
Phone: 850.488.8466/Suncom 278.8466 FAX: 850.921.0781/Suncom 291.0781
Internet address: http://www.dca.state.fl.us

CRITICAL STATE CONCERN FIELD OFFICE
2796 Overseas Highway, Suite 212
Marathon, FL 33050-2227
(305) 289-2402

COMMUNITY PLANNING
2555 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-2100
(850) 488-2356

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT
2555 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-2100
(850) 413-9969

HOUSING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
2555 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-2100
(850) 488-7956

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

COUNTY ATTORNEY

Daniel S. McIntyre

Heather Young ASSISTANT COUNTY ATTORNEY
Katherine Mackenzie-Smith ASSISTANT COUNTY ATTORNEY

February 25, 2002

Richard A. Lotspeich, Esq.
Assistant General Counsel
State of Florida
Department of Community Affairs
2555 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-2100

RE: **Port of Fort Pierce - Procedure for Adoption of Port Master Plan**

Dear Mr. Lotspeich:

Thank you for your letter of December 27, 2001. As a followup to my letter of December 17, 2001, please note that the planning area which constitutes the port has been expanded. The expanded area now includes property that is located within unincorporated St. Lucie County as well as property located within the corporate limits of the City of Fort Pierce. Based on this, it appears that the "appropriate local government" is now St. Lucie County so that the port master plan should be integrated into the coastal management element of the County's comprehensive plan.

Please let me know if you agree with my assessment.

Sincerely,

Daniel S. McIntyre
County Attorney

DSM/caf

Copy to: Board of County Commissioners
County Administrator
Community Development Director

JOHN D. DRUHN, District No. 1 • DOUG COWARD, District No. 2 • PAULA A. LEWIS, District No. 3 • FRANNIE HUTCHINSON, District No. 4 • CLIFF BARNES, District No. 5
County Administrator - Douglas M. Anderson
2300 Virginia Avenue • 3rd Floor Admin. Annex • Fort Pierce, FL 34982-5652 • Phone (561) 462-1415
FAX (561) 462-1440 • TDD (561) 462-1428

STATE OF FLORIDA

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS

"Dedicated to making Florida a better place to call home"

JEB BUSH
Governor

STEVEN M. SEIBERT
Secretary

December 27, 2001

RECEIVED
DEC 31 2001
COUNTY ATTORNEY

Mr. Daniel S. Mc Intyre
County Attorney
St. Lucie County
2300 Virginia Avenue
Fort Pierce, Florida 34982-5652

RE: Procedure for Adoption of Port Master Plan - City of Fort Pierce

Dear Mr. McIntyre:

The Department is in receipt of your letter of December 17, 2001 regarding the procedures for the preparation of the comprehensive port master plan and the integration of that master plan into the coastal management element of the City of Fort Pierce comprehensive plan under Section 163.3178(2)(k), Florida Statutes. We have reviewed your understanding of the procedures and can confirm that your understanding is consistent with the provisions of the statute. Accordingly, we concur with the procedures set forth in your letter.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any further questions regarding this matter.

Sincerely,

Richard A. Lotspeich
Assistant General Counsel

RAL/ms

2555 SHUMARD OAK BOULEVARD - TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32399-2100
Phone: 850.488.8466/Suncom 278.8466 FAX: 850.921.0781/Suncom 291.0781
Internet address: http://www.dca.state.fl.us

CRITICAL STATE CONCERN FIELD OFFICE
2796 Overseas Highway, Suite 212
Marathon, FL 33050-2227
(305) 289-2402

COMMUNITY PLANNING
2555 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-2100
(850) 488-2356

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT
2555 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-2100
(850) 413-9969

HOUSING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
2555 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-2100
(850) 488-7956

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

COUNTY ATTORNEY

Daniel S. McIntyre

Heather Young ASSISTANT COUNTY ATTORNEY
Katherine Mackenzie-Smith ASSISTANT COUNTY ATTORNEY

December 17, 2001

Cari L. Roth, Esquire
General Counsel
Department of Community Affairs
2555 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-2100

RE: **Procedure for Adoption of Port Master Plan for the Port of Fort Pierce**

Dear Ms. Roth:

St. Lucie County needs clarification as to the proper procedure for preparation and approval of a comprehensive port master plan as required by Section 163.3178(2)(k), Florida Statutes. The cited Section requires that each coastal management element of a comprehensive plan is required to include a port master plan for any listed deepwater port within the jurisdiction of the government preparing the relevant comprehensive plan.

Based on the statute, it appears that the appropriate procedure is:

1. Preparation of a comprehensive master plan for the deepwater port by the appropriate port authority (in this case, St. Lucie County).

2. Submission of the port master plan to the "appropriate local government" at least six months prior to the due date of the local government for integration into the coastal element. (In this case, the appropriate local government for comprehensive planning purposes is Fort Pierce.)

3. Integration of the port master plan into the overall coastal management element by the appropriate local government (Fort Pierce) and submission to the Department of Community Affairs for review.

JOHN D. BRUHN, District No. 1 • DOUG COWARD, District No. 2 • PAULA A. LEWIS, District No. 3 • FRANNIE HUTCHINSON, District No. 4 • CLIFF BARNES, District No. 5
County Administrator - Douglas M. Anderson
2300 Virginia Avenue • 3rd Floor Admin. Annex • Fort Pierce, FL 34982-5652 • Phone (561) 462-1415
FAX (561) 462-1440 • TDD (561) 462-1428

By the way of background, all of the planning area which constitutes the port is located within the jurisdictional boundaries of the City of Fort Pierce. Under the circumstances, it is the County's conclusion that the County's responsibility is for preparation and submission of the master plan. Fort Pierce's responsibility is review of the master plan and integration into its comprehensive plan.

On behalf of St. Lucie County, I would very much appreciate your confirmation of the foregoing procedure.

Sincerely,

Daniel S. McIntyre
County Attorney

DSM/caf

Copy to: Board of County Commissioners
County Administrator
Community Development Director
Economic Development Manager

Agenda Request

Item Number 5-A
Date: Mar 12, 2002

Consent [ ]
Regular [ ]
Public Hearing [X]
Leg. [X] Quasi-JD [ ]

To: Board of County Commissioners

Submitted By: Community Development Dept.

Presented By
Com. Development Director

SUBJECT: Consider draft Resolution No. 02-033, the Revised Master Plan for the Port of Ft. Pierce

BACKGROUND: Attached is a copy of Draft Resolution 02-033 which, if approved, would accept the revised Goals, Objectives and Policies (GOP's) for the Port of Ft. Pierce Master Plan. As the Board is aware, several months ago the Board contracted with the FAU Joint Center for Environmental and Urban Problems for the development of the revised Master Plan for the Port of Ft. Pierce. The Joint Center has prepared this Master Plan to meet the requirements of Chapter 163, Florida Statutes. The *Port Master Plan* is intended to be principally a "policy type" of document rather than a specific layout plan for the Port Area.

Following the Board's final action on this Master Plan, the County will initiate the process to have this Master Plan incorporated into the St. Lucie County Comprehensive Plan. This action would be consistent with the requirements of Chapter 163.3178(2)(k), Florida Statutes.

FUNDS AVAILABLE:

PREVIOUS ACTION:

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends that the Board approve Draft Resolution 02-033 and further recommends that the Board direct staff to initiate the Plan Amendment process to the County's Comprehensive Plan to provide for the incorporation of this document into the Local Comprehensive Plan and that a copy of this Master Plan be sent to the City of Ft. Pierce.

COMMISSION ACTION:
[ ] APPROVED [ ] DENIED
[ ] OTHER

CONCURRENCE:

Douglas M. Anderson
County Administrator

Coordination/ Signatures

County Attorney
Originating Dept.:
Finance:
Mgt. & Budget:
Other:
Purchasing:
Other:

(agend619a)

COUNTY COMMISSION REVIEW: March 12, 2002

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
Administration

MEMORANDUM

TO: County Commission

FROM: Community Development Director

DATE: March 6, 2002

SUBJECT: Consider Accepting the New Master Plan for the Port of Ft. Pierce.

Attached is a copy of Draft Resolution 02-033 which, if approved, would accept the revised Goals, Objectives and Policies (GOP's) for the Port of Ft. Pierce Master Plan. As the Board is aware, several months ago the Board contracted with the FAU Joint Center for Environmental and Urban Problems for the development of the new Master Plan for the Port of Ft. Pierce. The Joint Center has prepared this Master Plan to meet the requirements of Chapter 163, Florida Statutes. The *Port Master Plan* is intended to be principally a "policy type" of document rather than a specific layout plan for the Port Area. This Master Plan does not include detailed site layouts for the Port Area nor does it address specific land use and zoning matters that are more appropriately the responsibility of the local governing authority in the Port Area. That type of decision rests with the City of Ft. Piece or the County for those lands that lie within their territorial jurisdictions.

Through the development of this Master Plan, the consultants have employed a public participation process that has resulted in the receipt of extensive public input and coordination with all effected stakeholders in the area. On February 19, 2002, this Board, and the City Commission of Ft. Pierce held a joint workshop for the purpose of discussing the status of the Master Plan and reviewing the latest version of the Goals, Objectives and Policies of this Master Plan. Based upon the comments presented at that meeting, this final draft of the GOP's has been amended to reflect the issues raised and we believe the consensus agreements of both governing bodies.

Following the Board's final action on this Master Plan, the County will initiate the process to have this Master Plan incorporated into the St. Lucie County Comprehensive Plan. This action would be consistent with the requirements of Section 163.3178(2)(k), Florida Statutes.

When the Master Plan update process was initiated it was the original intention of all parties to have this Master Plan approved by the County Commission, since the Board is the recognized as the managing Authority for the Port of Ft. Pierce, and then transmit this Plan to the City of Ft. Pierce for incorporation into the City's Comprehensive Plan. However, through the development and definition of the "Port Planning Area", and by through the necessity of having to include the unincorporated areas of Taylor Creek and the North Jetty area of the Ft. Pierce Inlet into the Port Planning Area the law requires that the Port Master Plan be incorporated into, the County's Comprehensive Plan. Staff still recommends that following any adoption of this Port Master

Plan a copy of this Plan should be transmitted to the City of Ft. Pierce for possible inclusion in the City's local comprehensive plan.

Noting the above comments. staff recommends that the Board approve Draft Resolution 02-033 and further recommends that the Board direct staff to initiate the Plan Amendment process to the County's Comprehensive Plan to provide for the incorporation of this document into the Local Comprehensive Plan and that a copy of this Master Plan be sent to the City of Ft. Pierce.

If you have any questions, please let us know.

SUBMITTED:

Dennis J. Murphy, AICP
Community Development Director

DJM
PORT1A(H)
CC: County Administrator
City Administrator
County Attorney
City Attorney
James Murley

RESOLUTION 02-033

A RESOLUTION BY THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF ST. LUCIE COUNTY, FLORIDA ACCEPTING THE GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES FOR THE PORT OF FORT PIERCE MASTER PLAN

WHEREAS, the Board of County Commissioners of St. Lucie County, Florida, based on the testimony and evidence, including but not limited to the staff report, has made the following determinations:

1. Florida Statues, Section 163.3178 (2)(k), requires all recognized deepwater ports in the State of Florida prepare a master plan to be submitted to the appropriate local government for inclusion within that governments locally adopted comprehensive plan. Since the Port Planning Area covered by this Master Plan includes property within the incorporated and unincorporated area of the County, the appropriate local government is St. Lucie County.

2. The Port of Fort Pierce Master Plan is consistent with the comprehensive plan of St. Lucie County.

3. It is in the public interest to approve the Port of Fort Pierce Master Plan.

4. The County has held several public meetings and public hearings involving the public and the port area property owners, the purpose of which was to review the master plan.

5. On March 12, 2002, this Board held a public hearing on the proposed master plan for the Port of Ft. Pierce after publishing a notice of such hearing in the Port St. Lucie News and the Tribune,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of County Commissioners of St. Lucie County, Florida That:

PART A. **THE GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES FOR THE PORT OF FORT PIERCE MASTER PLAN ARE ACCEPTED TO READ AS FOLLOWS:**

See attached Exhibit 1

APR _ 4 2002

AFTER MOTION AND SECOND, the vote on this Resolution was as follows:

JOANNE HOLMAN, CLERK OF THE CIRCUIT COURT - SAINT LUCIE COUNTY
File Number: 2021339 OR BOOK 1505 PAGE 1483
Recorded:03/22/02 09:23

Chairman Doug Coward	AYE
Vice-Chairman Cliff Barnes	AYE
Commissioner John Bruhn	AYE
Commissioner Frannie Hutchinson	AYE
Commissioner Paula A. Lewis	AYE

PASSED AND DULY ADOPTED this 12th day of March 2002.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
ST. LUCIE COUNTY, FLORIDA

BY _____
Vice-Chairman

ATTEST:

DEPUTY CLERK

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND
CORRECTNESS:

COUNTY ATTORNEY

OR BOOK 1505 PAGE 1484